



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,536	07/16/2001	Thomas J. Graddis	3260.0028-01	3851
22852 75	590 09/24/2004		EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER			SPECTOR, LORRAINE	
LLP 1300 I STREET	r. NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	ASHINGTON, DC 20005		1647	
			DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/904,536	GRADDIS ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Lorraine Spector, Ph.D.	1647		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicatio	n appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address		
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Faill Any earn	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI misions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication experiod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, to period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a report. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI statute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	04 March 2004 and 01 July 2004	<u>4</u> .		
2a)[<u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the me					
	closed in accordance with the practice un	der <i>Ex part</i> e <i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	**.	
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 33-43,45,52-55,69-85,88-93,96-4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Claim(s) 33-41,69-80,134 and 135 is/are a Claim(s) 111-132 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to claim(s) 33-43,45,52-55,69-85,96-101 and	<u>n Sheet</u> is/are withdrawn from co allowed.	onsideration.		
Applicat	on Papers				
	The specification is objected to by the Exa				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to		* *		
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co The oath or declaration is objected to by the		, ,		
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docur. 2. Certified copies of the priority docur. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Busiee the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in App priority documents have been re ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage		
Attachmen	• •	_			
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948	4) Interview Sur	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date		
3) 🔲 Inforr	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI r No(s)/Mail Date		rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 42, 43, 45, 52-55, 81-85, 88-93, 96-101, 104-110, 133, 136-141.

Art Unit: 1647

DETAILED ACTION

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is withdrawn in view of applicants amendment and election.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of the restriction requirement of 5/04 in the reply filed on 7/1/04 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that (a) the inventions are not independent and distinct as required by 35 U.S.C. §121, (b) the search of all inventions would not present a serious burden to the examiner, and (c) that applicants amendment did not necessitate the current restriction requirement. This is not found persuasive because with respect to point (a), the phrase "independent and distinct inventions in the statute has been historically treated by the Office as "independent or distinct inventions", see MPEP 802.01. In this case, the inventions are distinct, as they each require a separate search of the art with respect to enablement, as set forth in the requirement. Applicants assertion that "this is not the test to determine whether claims are distinct" is not persuasive. While the MPEP does not provide specific guidance for this fact situation, the Examiner has pointed out the reasons for the finding that the search in this case is burdensome. In fact, the Examiner attempted to search this case prior to making the requirement, and only made the requirement after determining that the search was burdensome. It is for this reason that point (b) above is also not persuasive. Finally, applicants third point is not germane. Restriction may be properly made at any time during prosecution at which the Examiner finds such necessary. In this case, the amendments filed 3/4/04 presented the claims in a fashion that required extensive extra searching in order to properly consider enablement of the claimed inventions, which searching proved to be burdensome, for reasons cited above.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 42, 43, 45, 52-55, 81-85, 88-93, 96-101, 104-110, 133 and 136-141 .are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a

nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 7/1/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 111-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 111 is incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: there is no connection between step (a) and step (b). It cannot be determined how the administration relates to the transplant step, and is what fashion. Similarly, claim 112 is indefinite as it is not clear at what point in the process the administration is to occur. Additionally, it is not clear how administering radiation and/or chemotherapy is part of a process of transplanting hematopoietic stem cells.

Claim 122 is indefinite as it is not clear whether the cells of part (b) of the claim are the same cells as in part (a) of the claim; amendment of "transplanting hematopoietic" to read – transplanting *said* hematopoietic—would be remedial.

Claim 123 is indefinite as it is not clear at what point in the process the administration is to occur. Additionally, it is not clear how administering radiation and/or chemotherapy is part of a process of transplanting hematopoietic stem cells.

The remaining claims are rejected for depending from an indefinite claim.

Art Unit: 1647

Advisory Information

Claims 33-41, 69-80 and 134-135 are allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Lorraine M. Spector. Dr. Spector can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. Effective 1/21/2004, Dr. Spector's telephone number is 571-272-0893.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, please contact the Examiner's supervisor, Ms. Brenda Brumback, at telephone number 571-272-0961.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 872-9306 (before final rejection) or (703)872-9307 (after final). Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to 571-273-0893.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

Lorraine Spector, Ph.D. Primary Examiner